

Hoosier Archives is a periodic listing of the Diplomacy library of Walter Buchanan, R. R. 3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052; Archives Director, NFFFGBDD; a Director of The Diplomacy Association; and a member of IFW. Additions to the library are solicited, either through originals or a loan to permit Xeroxing. Reprints of Diplomacy articles are published, although original contributions are solicited. Although the library is private, its use is for postal Diplomacy in general. Anyone desiring a copy at cost of any of the publications listed, which are unavailable elsewhere, should write to the above address. Many original spares are also now available. To subscribe to Hoosier Archives, send one stamped, self-addressed envelope per issue. Trades are also welcomed.

DIPLOMACY--INTRODUCTION TO THE STRATEGY & TACTICS OF DIPLOMACY

by Larry Peery

Chapter 1: Austria

Dave Lebling aptly described Austria's position in relation to the other countries in Diplomacy when he said: "Only a diplomat can play Austria well." (GLOCKORIA #5) Mr. Lebling pointed out that except for her nearness to the Balkan's unoccupied supply centers Austria has no real advantage in the game, other than that of flexibility. It is to Austria's flexible position that Lebling attributes Austria's successes when she is played by a good player.

A. Acquisition of Unoccupied Supply Centers. As part of her underlying strategy to control the Balkans Austria has traditionally claimed Serbia and Greece as her share of the twelve unoccupied supply centers existing at the opening of the game.

Using standard opening moves: (Spring 1901) F Trieste to Albania, A Vienna to Trieste; A Budapest to Serbia and (Fall 1901) F Albania to Greece, A Trieste holds, A Serbia supports F Albania to Greece, Austria should have no trouble gaining control of these centers if she does not face a strong attack from Italy, Russia, and Turkey.

Even an Italian attack on Trieste, through Tyrolia and Venice, in the opening year can be repulsed or at least delayed while Austria occupies these centers.

The movement of the Army Trieste (assuming Austria was successful in her movement (Spring 1901) A Vienna to Trieste) in the Fall of 1901 is a critical decision Austria must make. If she leaves it in Trieste in the Fall she must build two armies in Vienna and Budapest in the Winter of 1901 (with her two additional supply centers, Greece and Serbia); but if she moves her army out of Trieste in the Fall she has the added option of building a fleet there to use against Italy or Turkey. The problem lies in moving out of Trieste in the face of a possible Italian attack on that supply center from Venice. Even if Austria does have a nonaggression pact or alliance with Italy, building such a fleet would amount to a declaration of war on Italy.

B. Alliances. As Mr. Lebling further pointed out in his article in GLOCKORIA: "Austria has more potential enemies (and allies) than any other nation." This is indeed the case and Austria must be aware of the intentions of every nation on the board to correctly decide her own strategy. There are four basic alliances Austria can enter into in the early stages of the game.

1. With France Against Italy. In engaging in an alliance with France against Italy, Austria is better off to obtain non-aggression pacts with Russia and Turkey than to attempt to fight a two front war. Austria, who will usually bear the burden of facing the bulk of the Italian forces, would have a difficult time opposing an Italian drive on Trieste and an attack from Russia or Turkey.

Still, if Austria is unsure of her eastern neighbors and the reliability of non-aggression pacts with them, she often is better off to seek a firm alliance with one or the other of them against the other. Turkey is usually the better ally in the short-run since she can devote her entire force to an attack on Russia whereas Russia will have to divert some of her forces to face a possible attack from Germany or England.

Austria in alliance with France should have no difficulty in eliminating Italy (which is a prime reason for Italy's poor position in player preference surveys). In such an alliance, Austria should seek control of Naples and Venice. Naples because it borders on the key Ionian Sea and Venice because it acts as a buffer between France and Austria; both provinces because they border on Rome. Austria should yield Rome and Tunis to France. An Austrian army and fleet combined with a French army and fleet are usually enough to defeat Italy. Once Venice has fallen (through an attack from Trieste with support from Piedmont or Tyrolia) Italy's remaining supply centers should follow quickly.

2. With Russia Against Turkey. Austria's decision as to allying with either Turkey or Russia in the eastern campaign is the crucial decision she must make. An alliance with Russia at the start of the game directed at eliminating Turkey will usually be successful provided Russia does not face an attack from England and Germany in the north and Austria does not face a strong Italian attack in the west.

In such an alliance Austria can reasonably hope to gain Bulgaria, and hopefully Rumania, though it is definitely to Austria's benefit to hold that province if she plans to fight Russia later because it gives her complete control of the Balkans (one of Austria's basic long-range goals).

Austria, if planning to fight Russia, should be careful not to allow Russian fleets access to the Mediterranean or Aegean.

On balance, this is probably the best alliance Austria can make; especially if she can persuade Germany or England to join with her in a mid-game alliance against Russia.

3. With Germany Against Russia. An alliance between Austria and Germany against Russia is unlikely to be either practical or successful unless Turkey and Italy remain neutral and both countries (Austria and Germany) devote most of their forces to the attack. It is unlikely that Turkey and Italy will remain neutral but usually Turkey's help and assistance can be bought by promising her a share of the spoils (eg. Rumania or Sevastapol). A three-way attack by Austria, Germany, and Turkey is fatal to Russia but offers Austria little since most of the Russian supply centers fall to Germany or Turkey. However, if Austria is assured of German support against Turkey in the mid game and Russia is being played by a strong player it is better for Austria to eliminate Russia as soon as possible.

Austria should beware of allowing Turkey access to Rumania and Sevastapol since once Turkey has entrenched herself around the Black Sea she has a natural defensive position which can be quickly extended to an offensive threat against Austria. Often Germany is engaged during the mid game in a fight on her western front against England or France and must devote the bulk of her forces to that fight while Austria is usually by this time fighting Italy and must devote some of her forces to that battle. Since both countries are engaged in other fights Turkey has a great advantage in that she can devote her full force against one country or part of both countries' forces instead of facing their combined total strengths.

4. With Turkey Against Russia. Austria should not ally with Turkey against Russia for various reasons mentioned above unless the Turkish player presents less of a potential threat to Austria; based on a careful evaluation of both players abilities.

An Austrian and Turkish attack on Russia rapidly creates a single nation on Austria's eastern front (Turkey) which has few alternatives to attacking Austria once Russia is eliminated since Austria by this time blocks Turkey's paths into Europe.

C. Non-aggression Pacts. Non-aggression Pacts between Austria and at least one of her three major neighbors are a key part of Austria's survival and growth. Normally, Austria obtains a non-aggression pact with Germany and then considers her position vis-a-vis Italy while she attempts to either get Russia and Turkey fighting between themselves or seeks an alliance with one of them against the other.

1. With Italy. Austria's course of action vis-a-vis Italy is her second crucial decision. If Austria can be sure of maintaining a neutral status in a Turkish-Russian conflict and can achieve a strong alliance with France she should move to destroy Italy at once. Otherwise, Austria should avoid fighting Italy until the mid game and should encourage Italy to serve as a buffer state while Austria builds up her own forces.

Once Austria has built up her forces in the mid game she can either ally with France against Italy or move against Italy by herself.

Austria must constantly bear in mind that Italy has only two directions in which she can realistically advance; against France or against Austria. Often, the best course is for Austria to encourage a Franco-Italian war and then move into Italy and take her supply centers when they are unoccupied.

2. With Germany. Normally Austria and Germany have either an alliance against Russia or a non-aggression pact. Both countries are usually too busy with their problems elsewhere to fight each other.

D. Defensive Game. If Austria is faced with a Russian, Turkish and Italian attack she cannot defend herself for any length of time unless she can break the three-way attack against her. This can be done in one of several ways: by persuading one of the three attackers to either turn on the others, or to halt its attack; or by persuading a second tier country (eg. England, France, Germany) to intervene by attacking one of the attackers. This calls for all of the "diplomatic" ability a player has and must be carried out while Austria is still in a strong enough position to delay the attack on her.

If the alliance cannot be broken Austria's only course of action is to stubbornly defend herself or attempt to "throw the game" to one of the three attackers in exchange for favors in another game. One of the more devious aspects in this strategy is throwing the game to your worst enemy and thereby increasing his strength considerably but not enough to win and thus forcing his own allies to turn on him.

Rarely, is such a three-way attack formulated and if it is often it will fall through before Austria is destroyed.

More difficult to assess is the Russian or Turkish and Italian attack on Austria. An Italian drive on Trieste often ties up enough Austrian forces defending it to allow Russia or Turkey to capture Serbia or Greece. Once Austria has lost these two supply centers it is a mere matter of time before the homeland falls.

However, if Austria can persuade Russia to attack Turkey or vice versa and draw off some of the pressure and can get France to attack Italy she can survive and flourish. It is dangerous for Austria to play a defensive game since she is vulnerable from so many sides; a betrayal by any ally may cause her entire front to collapse.

Assuming she is faced with an Italian-Turkish attack and has managed to persuade Russia and France to come to her aid Austria should allow these two countries to gather the bulk of her enemies' supply centers and concentrate on positioning her own forces for a move against one or the other of her allies during the end game. Austria must be careful during the mid game to avoid attacking Turkey or Russia on a one-for-one basis since even if she should be successful the campaign will take too long. It is better for her to have an ally (either Germany, England, or France). She can usually engage Italy during the mid game without assistance but France's help will shorten the game considerably.

In summary, Austria must avoid above all else engaging in a long, drawn out war with either Italy or Turkey since it will only engage her forces at a time when other countries are looking for vulnerable victims.

E. Offensive Game. Offensively, Austria has great flexibility since she can attack any one of three countries and has three or four potential allies.

1. Austria and Russia Against Turkey. This is a beneficial alliance as has been pointed out since Turkey has no ready aid and cannot resist a joint attack from Austria and Russia for any length of time. Also, it is beneficial through the mid game since Russia will most likely have other avenues of expansion even after Turkey is eliminated while Turkey after eliminating Russia has little choice but to attack Austria.

2. Austria and Turkey Against Russia. This is a good alliance in some ways, bad in others. It does eliminate a strong power but often gives Turkey just enough of a start to not only conquer Austria but also win. Turkey, when Russia is gone, can only go after Italy or Austria (shifting her forces north to use against Germany or England is highly impractical) and usually prefers to have Italy's help against Austria than vice versa.

3. Austria, Turkey and Germany Against Russia. A nice over-whelming alliance but does little for Austria. Turkey and Germany make the greatest gains in both supply centers and board position.

4. Austria and France Against Italy. Austria's second best alliance since it provides additional strength to off-set Turkey's gains against Russia, or Russia's gains against Turkey. It also gives Austria control of the central Mediterranean which can be useful in the mid and end game.

F. The Waiting Game. Austria often finds that Russia and Turkey have bumbled into a senseless war over the Black Sea (especially if these countries are in the hands of a weak or inexperienced player) and that Italy is either involved in a war with France in a dispute over the Piedmont or making no progress in an attack against Austria. Rather than intervene in such a situation Austria should concentrate on gaining units wherever she can without

launching into a full-scale wide front war and, instead, seek alliances for the end game with second tier countries.

Austria must carefully avoid the greatest threat that exists to any country; that of becoming the "middle man" in a three man end game. For instance, if by 1907 there are three remaining powers on the board, Austria should make sure that she is not caught between two of them but instead is either behind one, or below both (eg. England, Russia, and Austria; France, Germany, and Austria; not Italy, Austria, Russia; etc.).

.....

The "article" above is the first installment of "Out of the Archives'" longest strategy and tactics reprint series to date, a seven-part series comprising Larry Peery's book, Diplomacy--Introduction to the Strategy and Tactics of Diplomacy. The book is broken down into seven chapters, one on each of the seven major powers in Diplomacy. You have just seen Chapter One on the play of Austria.

Larry is now starting another interesting project, a study into the "diplomatic" as opposed to the tactical area of Diplomacy. He proposes to run a seven game-seven man tournament as a data source to discover what makes a Diplomacy player tick. That ought to be revealing! Anyway, through the use of questionnaires, etc., Larry intends to do a complete sociological-psychological research project on the personal interactions of Diplomacy players to determine how the John Smythe's get the John Doe's to trust them completely before deliv-
 ering ye olde stabberro! If you are a good player and would like to participate and cooperate fully in this project, write: Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, Calif. 92102.

And now, folks, another first for Hoosier Archives--the first printing of Dippydom's first regularly scheduled subjective rating system, the eagerly awaited "Beyerlein Player Poll"! Below are the results of the first poll. It will appear hereafter on a quarterly basis.

THE FIRST BEYERLEIN PLAYER POLL (May 1971) RESULTS:

TOP BOARD	S	N	S - score or total points tabulated from ballots
1. John Smythe	120	7	
2. John Beshara	120	10	N - number of ballots listing the player's name on top board or second board
3. Eugene Prosnitz	107	7	
4. Rod Walker	85	8	
5. Edi Birsan	67	6	
6. Brenton Ver Ploeg	66	5	
7. Buddy Tretick	65	8	

SECOND BOARD	S	N
8. Hal Naus	48	7
9. Doug Beyerlein	43	6
10. Derek Nelson	38	3
11. Charles Turner	33	3
12. Charles Reinsel	33	4
13. Pete Rosamalia	33	4
14. John McCallum	30	4

Players with 11 points or more: Ansoff, Borecki, Bytwerk, Childs, Eller, Gemignani, Gygax, Keathley, Key, Kuch, Lakofka, Lebling, R. Miller, Peery, Phillips, Pournelle, Pulsipher, Schelz, St. Cyr, Van Andel, von Metzke, & Wells.

COMMENTARY: Only 11 ballots were received out of a possible 200. Some ballots were received after the May 25 deadline. These were allowed because some people did not receive the ballot until after the 25th. No doubt this contributed to the poor return. The ballots for the second poll will be distributed sometime before September. All questions should be directed to Doug Beyerlein at : 3924 S. W. Southern, Seattle, Washington 98116.